DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton, on Wednesday 6 December 2017 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: V Thomson (Chairman), B Duffin (for applications 1-9), C Gould, M Gray, C Kemp, G Minshull (for applications 1-2) and A Thomas (for applications 1-8)

Apologies: Councillors: Y Bendle, F Ellis, L Neal and J Mooney

Substitute Members: Councillors: L Dale for F Ellis, N Legg for L Neal, G Wheatley for J Mooney

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Development Management Team Leader (R Collins), the Major Projects Team Leader (T Lincoln), the Senior Planning Officer (C Raine), the Planning Officer (J Jackson), the Listed Buildings Officer (P Whitehead) and the Landscape Architect (R Taylor)

The press and 104 members of the public were also in attendance

366. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared interests in the matters listed below. Unless indicated otherwise, they remained in the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/2430</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbyed by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/0420/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbyed by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2289/H</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbyed by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2290/LB</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbyed by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2345/H</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>L Dale</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbyed by Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2361/CU</td>
<td>WICKLEWOOD</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbyed by Applicant and Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
367. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 8 November 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

368. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Planning and Environment, which was presented by the officers. The Committee received updates to the report, which are appended to these minutes at Appendix A.

The following speakers addressed the meeting with regard to the applications listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>SPEAKER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/2430</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>H Elias – Costessey Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P O’Connor – Costessey Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S Codman – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K Kerrigan – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr V Bell – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr A Pond – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr T East – County Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/0420/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>H Elias – Costessey Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>T Laidlaw – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K Kerrigan – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr A Pond – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr T East – County Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/1442/F</td>
<td>SEETHING</td>
<td>K Shepherdson – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>J Long – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J Jenkins – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2141/F</td>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>E Jinks – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2289/H</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>J Senior - Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2290/LB</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>J Senior - Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2345/H</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>S Gregory – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M Provis - Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2361/CU</td>
<td>WICKLEWOOD</td>
<td>S Weston – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>P Meacock – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr M Edney – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/2481/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>K Dade - Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Committee made the decisions indicated in Appendix B of these minutes, conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and subject to the final determination of the Director of Planning and Environment.

369. ENFORCEMENT REPORT

Members considered the report of the Director of Planning and Environment regarding the enforcement case at Great Moulton (ref:2017/8275). After consideration, it was RESOLVED 7-0 to authorise that enforcement be taken to remedy the breach of planning control, with a three-month compliance period, with the hope that negotiations with the developer resolve the matter within that period.

370. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 4.28pm)

__________________

Chairman
Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
6 December 2017

Items 1 to 2 heard from 10am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Updates</th>
<th>Page No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T 2016/2430</td>
<td>Farmland Road objection brochure received 01.12.2017</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main points and any new points raised:

- Planning history and refusal should be maintained on the same grounds. Officer response – This is covered in the Committee report.
- Development boundary- should be a plan led system. Officer response – The assessment against the development plan and the NPPF as a material consideration and tests of harm significantly and demonstrably outweighing the benefits of the proposal in the absence of a 5-year supply of housing is set out in the report.
- Precedent – cumulative impacts should be considered.
- 5 year land supply – if members are minded to approve the application it should at least be deferred to await the imminent 5 year supply figures.
- Infrastructure – no new grounds raised.
- Circular walkway – no new grounds raised.
- Contamination – no new grounds raised.
- LVIA – no new grounds raised.
- SuDs and Flood Risk – question whether it is feasible to accommodate the proposed drainage system within the available developable area (it is possible that soakaways will need to be larger than those propose; there is limited space to accommodate soakaways; scheme likely more reliant on the lagoons given limited space for soakaways.) Officer comment – The LLFA have clarified that the applicant has provided indicative layouts for this outline application and has indicated there is sufficient room in the development to incorporate the proposed drainage strategy. Considering the applicant may not choose private soakaways and we believe the development to be in Fluvial Flood zone 1, we understand that there is sufficient information provided at this outline stage.
- SuDs and flood risk - location of part of lagoon still in future flood zone 3. Officer comment – The proposed lagoon locations are indicative at this outline stage. A small part of the indicative lagoon is in future flood zone 3. Climate change scenarios allow for a range of allowances between +35% and +65%. Future FZ 3 does not encroach upon the lagoon for the +35% scenario. The Environment Agency (EA) and the LLFA have raised no objection to the applications, however clarification is awaited.
from the EA following this additional objection from FRAG.

- SuDs and flood risk – consideration of seasonal variation in groundwater is required to inform the drainage strategy. Officer comment – The LLFA have advised that the letters state that looking at the regional chalk aquifer the groundwater levels were at or near their minimum when the test took place. However this does not represent the groundwater within the superficial deposits at the site. The applicant has provided an indication of groundwater levels in these superficial deposits which we have requested be tested further at detailed design stage through a condition. As a precaution, you could expand this condition to include continuous groundwater monitoring across the development until the detailed designs are provided and ideally over the winter period (with a minimum of period of Dec 17 through to April 18 via a groundwater logger).

- SuDs and flood risk - the FRA needs to revisit the likelihood and magnitude of groundwater flood risk. Officer comment- The LLFA have confirmed that based on the information provided by the applicant on site groundwater levels we would not agree with this opinion. Shallow groundwater could be an issue nearer the river (where there is no housing) but further testing will inform the detailed design of infiltration features and any other mitigation that may be required.

- SuDs and flood risk - solution features need to be considered further and their impact to deliver infiltration drainage. Officer comment – The LLFA advise that they would encourage any developer to identify the risk of subsidence and propose suitable SuDS features considering the level of risk during detailed design. The applicant may therefore, during detailed design, need to exclude private soakaways from the surface water drainage strategy in favour of planar infiltration systems such as permeable paving, wide swales and shallow infiltration basins”.

- SuDs and flood risk - if an alternative drainage strategy is required then reconsideration of land allocation to ensure that the treatment component can be accommodated in respect of water framework directive compliance. Officer comment – The drainage strategy proposed demonstrates that there is a workable solution to the drainage, as confirmed by the Lead Local Flood Authority. A condition would be imposed to require a detailed drainage strategy to be approved, at the reserved matters stage, including appropriate measures for water quality. It is considered reasonable and proportionate to require this detail at the reserved matters stage.

- Ecology – Eel have been found in the River Tud for the first time in 40 years. This serves to
emphasise the importance of the water quality of the river and importance of an appropriate drainage solution. Officer comment – The impact of the proposal on water quality of the River Tud is set out in paragraphs 4.123 to 4.133 of the report.

- Ecology – light pollution on bats, foxes and owls from light from the development. Officer comment - This is covered in the report. A biodiversity management plan would be a requirement by condition and lighting within the river recreation area is to be restricted unless approved.

- Ecology - The river area is currently free from human activity and the precise details of works required to bring activity here is unknown – ecological impacts. Officer comment – This relates to application 2017/0420. The report sets out the proposed enhancements and harm through the introduction of human activity and the Council’s Ecologist raises no objection advising these impacts can be mitigated and managed through a biodiversity management plan.

- Highways – maintain previous concerns raised. A gradient profile is submitted which shows the steepness of the road. A report from a Cotswold transport planning is submitted – a transport assessment should have been submitted (not a transport statement) which should have included junction capacity assessment; sustainability of the site is overestimated; don’t consider appropriate gradients can be achieved within the estate development. Officer comment – NCC Highways have reviewed the FRAG brochure and advise that whilst the revised (second edition) report expands on their previous highway comments, it does not add anything new or material that would lead to the County Council to either provide a further response or change our recommendation to these planning applications. In terms of the gradient of the road, NCC Highways confirm in their consultation response that “It is acknowledged that the gradient of Farmland Road is steep and in excess of the desirable maximum defined in accessibility standards, which will undoubtedly discourage some residents from walking to local services. However, in all other respects it accords with the appropriate highway standards for this scale of development. Additionally, whilst guidance on the gradient of roads refers to a desirable maximum of 1:20 and absolute maximum of 1:12, this relates to the construction of new roads and footways. Whereas there is an acceptance that in some existing instances roads and footways will be steeper than this. I fully accept that during very cold weather Farmland Road could become slippery.”
However, this is an existing residential road and the steepness in itself would not result in a serious or frequent risk to road users."

- Viability - reiterate previous concerns. Officer comment – the viability of the application is set out in paragraphs 4.179 to 4.184 of the report.

5 additional letters of objection received following publication of the Committee agenda.

Additional grounds/comments:
How can the council assess the impact of the proposals on infrastructure without a comment from NHS England/the GP surgery? Officer comment – No comments were received from NHS England, the Clinical Commissioning group or Roundwell Medical Practice as a result of the consultation with them. Whilst the Council consults NHS England and the Clinical Commissioning group together with some local GP surgeries on planning applications, this is to enable them to help plan capacity. GPs are independent contractors of the NHS and so are essentially private businesses. New surgeries and additional capacity within surgeries are funded/instigated through the relevant primary health care body and are not provided by S106/CIL.

Further comments on the FRAG brochure dated 1st December are awaited from the Environment Agency in regards to flood risk. The recommendation is therefore amended to request delegated authority to approve subject to no objection from the Environment Agency on these final matters.

2 2017/0420 • See updates for 2016/2430 84
Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
6 December 2017

Items 3 to 11 from 1.30pm onwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Updates</th>
<th>Page No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 2017/1442</td>
<td>No updates</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4 2017/2141 | Parish Council  
Object.  
Reiterate previous comments which are: refusal on the grounds that the 2 houses proposed to replace the existing house and garage block for plot 15 are out of scale with the development and existing adjacent properties, and also the encroachment of the rear boundary into agricultural land.  
Highway Authority  
No objection subject to condition.  
3 objections received:  
• the proposed extensions beyond the building line  
• encroachment into the Conservation Area.  
• The issue of increased traffic as a result of additional, large houses is extremely concerning.  
• the heavy vehicles that have already started work on the site have already resulted in dangerous levels of mud being spread over the road, increased traffic congestion and increased wear and tear on the residential road. This increases risks for pedestrians and drivers alike.  
• it is surprising that the planning permission was approved in the first place- particularly as it far exceeds the village plan for new housing. Therefore, to approve revised plans that clearly seek to manipulate and exploit the site and the concessions already made, would absolutely damage the integrity of the planning department.  
• Original comments raised still stand  
• The house proposed for Plot 15 in particular is a very large 3 story building of a type new to this development and 2 metres higher than the existing building and appears unchanged from the previous amendment.  
• Overbearing/loss of amenity/overshadowing the effect of the size and positioning of the house on Plot 15 is that it is overbearing and as my aspect is only a little east of south means a loss of amenity & overshadowing especially as this is where I have a greenhouse and vegetable patch.  
• Adverse impact on the Conservation Area. Any sense of a mix of old and new will be lost and this is to be regretted.  
Officer comments:  
It is considered that all of the points raised are adequately addressed in the committee report.  
On a point of clarification, the ridge height increase from the existing dwelling to that proposed on plot 15 is | 107     |
A letter has been received from the applicants and passed to all members of the committee. Its contents describe the personal needs of the applicants in terms of providing the extension and facilities as proposed within the application. It is important to note, as set out in the officer report, that any works to a listed building resulting in harm, whether substantial or less than substantial harm, would need to be weighed against the public benefits for undertaking those works. It is not considered that there are any public benefits from this proposal. Also, to bring a property up to ‘modern living’ standards is not a consideration or justification to works to a Listed Building.

The applicant mentions the building is not visible from the public highway, a buildings visibility is applied when assessing the impact of development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area but this is not a consideration with a Listed Building, whose significance must be protected despite visibility from the public realm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 2017/2289</td>
<td>A letter has been received from the applicants and passed to all members of the committee. Its contents describe the personal needs of the applicants in terms of providing the extension and facilities as proposed within the application. It is important to note, as set out in the officer report, that any works to a listed building resulting in harm, whether substantial or less than substantial harm, would need to be weighed against the public benefits for undertaking those works. It is not considered that there are any public benefits from this proposal. Also, to bring a property up to ‘modern living’ standards is not a consideration or justification to works to a Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2017/2290</td>
<td>The applicant mentions the building is not visible from the public highway, a buildings visibility is applied when assessing the impact of development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area but this is not a consideration with a Listed Building, whose significance must be protected despite visibility from the public realm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 2017/2345</td>
<td>No update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 2017/2361</td>
<td>3 additional letter of support received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 2017/2370</td>
<td>The application description has been updated to reflect the amendment to the application to remove the request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Additional comments from applicant

- When called the Council they were advised permission as not required for height and size of salon.
- Working in the salon in garden allows my partner to continue to work whilst looking after her child
- Only 10-15 customers a week
- Live on the busiest road in Diss and Tesco located behind where large group congregate in the cars and mopeds until all hours so no significant additional disturbance.
- Shared access with 129 where we walk 2-3 steps into their garden
- Setting up a business from home should be a good thing.
- Significant impact on family if refused
- Bottles are washed and recycled and hair waste is put in domestic bin, not a lot of waste to warrant industrial waste containers
- Suggest only using front door

### Seven additional letters of support from 5 households making 8 in total

- No noise and disturbance caused
- Working hours fit in well with working needs including my family members
- Support small local and well-respected business venture
- Salon is not open full time and until 9pm every night as stated
- Customers park around town and not in neighbour’s spaces
- Background noise from Victoria Road is already loud
- Hair dryer used infrequently throughout the week will not cause significant noise

### Two additional letter of objection making three in total

- Access is only for residents
- Can’t have windows open from noise and disturbance
- Why has hair salon been allowed to operate for so long
- Prevents enjoyment of garden
- Salon operates all hours not just hours on application
- Plenty of empty premises in town

**Highways:** No objection

**Environmental Quality Team**

**Object**

- Having considered that nature and location of this proposal we are unable to support the application
| • Consider there could be a significant impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of 129 Victoria Road from potential noise and disturbance from activities in the shed and customers passing through the garden to access the business. |
| Officer comments |
| • The access through the house involves many steps and going through the living accommodation. Notwithstanding this it is not considered that it would be possible to successfully restrict the use of the rear entrance by planning condition. |
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

NOTE:
Conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee are in summary form only and subject to the Director of Planning and Environment’s final determination.

Major Applications

1  Appl. No   :  2016/2430  
               Parish   :  COSTESSEY

   Applicants Name  :  Mrs Katrina Kozersky  
   Site Address     :  Land North Of Farmland Road Costessey Norfolk  
   Proposal         :  Outline application with access and landscaping (all other matters reserved) for 83 dwellings (including 27 affordable dwellings) with areas of public open space, sustainable drainage systems and associated infrastructure.

   Decision        :  Members voted unanimously for Refusal (contrary to officer recommendation, which was lost unanimously)

Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation

1. Members acknowledged that some efforts had been made to mitigate the reasons given for refusal of the application when it was considered in July 2017, but felt that these were insufficient to overturn their previous decision, based on the previous reasons:

   a) The proposal would, by virtue of the encroachment of the development in the valley of the River Tud, result in an unacceptable visual impact on the landscape of the River Valley and Easton Fringe Farmland character areas which amounts to significant and demonstrable harm to the landscape and local character and distinctiveness of the area and therefore fails to comply with policy DM4.5 and 1.4 part d) i) of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015, policy 2 of the JCS and Para 61 of the NPPF.

   b) It is considered that whilst the scheme fulfils the economic and social roles of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF, the scheme does not fulfil the environmental role by virtue of the adverse visual impact on the landscape which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of housing, affordable housing and open space. Therefore, on balance the scheme is not considered to represent a sustainable development as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) when considered as a whole.

2. Concerns were raised over accessibility and sustainability, and the resulting harm due to an overuse of cars for users of local services and members agreed for this to be added to the reasons for refusal.
App. No : 2017/0420/F
Parish : COSTESSEY

Applicants Name : Mrs Katrina Kozersky
Site Address : Land North Of Farmland Road Costessey Norfolk
Proposal : Provision of two circular recreational walks, including boardwalks and associated landscaping and biodiversity enhancements (Linked with application 2016/2430)

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Refusal (contrary to officer recommendation, which was lost unanimously)

Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation
1. Insufficient information received to show how the site would be accessed by pedestrians or vehicles in an emergency situation;
2. Proposal is contrary to DM4.5 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, as in the River Valley would have an unacceptable impact and would not enhance the natural character and appearance of the area.

Other Applications

App. No : 2017/1442/F
Parish : SEETHING

Applicants Name : Mr Robin Key
Site Address : Land To The South Of Holmlea Seething Street Seething Norfolk
Proposal : 2 new detached dwellings with attached single garages

Decision : Members voted 5-4 for Refusal

Refused

Reasons for Refusal
1. Contrary to DM1.3
2. Harm To landscape
3. Unsustainable development

App. No : 2017/2141/F
Parish : BROOKE

Applicants Name : Mr Anthony Spurgeon
Site Address : 49 High Green Brooke NR15 1JA
Proposal : Replacement of 49/49A, High Green with erection of two new dwellings

Decision : Members voted 6-0 (with 3 abstentions) for Refusal (contrary to officer recommendation, which was lost 2-6 (with 1 abstention)

Refused

Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation
Scale, massing and design of dwellings, in particular Plot 14, out of character with immediate area.
5  
App. No    : 2017/2289/H  
Parish     : WYMONDHAM  

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs D G & J E Senior  
Site Address    : Beech House 20 Middleton Street Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0AD  
Proposal       : Two storey rear extension  

Decision       : Members voted 9-0 for Approval (contrary to officer recommendation, which was lost 0-9)  

Approved with conditions  
1. Sympathetic materials to be used, painted flint work facade and matching fenestration  
2. Remainder of conditions to be advised by officers  

Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation  
Due to the sympathetic design and modest nature of the proposed extension, members did not consider the impact to be harmful to the listed building.

6  
App. No    : 2017/2290/LB  
Parish     : WYMONDHAM  

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs D G & J E Senior  
Site Address    : Beech House 20 Middleton Street Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0AD  
Proposal       : Two storey rear extension  

Decision       : Members voted 9-0 for Approval (contrary to officer recommendation, which was lost 0-9)  

Approved with conditions  
1. Sympathetic materials to be used, painted flint work facade and matching fenestration  
2. Tbc  

Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation  
Due to the sympathetic design and modest nature of the proposed extension, members did not consider the impact to be harmful to the listed building.

7  
App. No    : 2017/2345/H  
Parish     : HETHERSETT  

Applicants Name : Mr Mark Provis  
Site Address    : 19 Firs Road Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3EH  
Proposal       : Two-storey with lean to single-storey rear extension  

Decision       : Members voted 8-0 (with 1 abstention) for Approval  

Approved with conditions  
1 Full Planning permission time limit  
2 In accord with submitted drawings
8 Appl. No : 2017/2361/CU
Parish : WICKLEWOOD

Applicants Name : Mr Peter Meaco
Site Address : Church Farm 56 Church Lane Wicklewood Norfolk NR18 9QH
Proposal : 8 tents on lower field for spring and summer camping and mixed used barn for 2 charity and 8 other functions.

Decision : Members voted 9-0 for Refusal

Refused

1 Unsuitable for continued of agricultural use of the barn
2 Inadequate Access Visibility
3 Inadequate access to the site restricted width of access
4 Inadequate parking provision demonstrated
5 Detrimental to neighbour amenity
6 Unacceptable flood risk for glamping site

Note: Enforcement action authorised, per Scheme of Delegation.

9 Appl. No : 2017/2370/RVC
Parish : GREAT MOULTON

Applicants Name : Mr Adam Price
Site Address : Hope Valley Low Common Road Great Moulton NR16 1LP
Proposal : Variation of conditions 4, 6 and 8 of planning consent 2016/1114 - (Change of use of land to a mix of single Gypsy and Traveller residential pitch and paddocks for the keeping and breeding of horses, together with widening the existing access onto Overwood Lane, closure of northern access onto Overwood Lane, and closure of the existing access onto Low Common Road) - Retention of mobile wash-room block and not erecting approved day room. Not installing all approved external lighting.

Decision : Members voted 8-0 for Approval

Approved with conditions

1 Temporary consent of 4 years
2 Occupation by Gypsies and Travellers
3 No commercial activity
4 No more than 2 mobiles, 2 touring and toilet block
5 Retain trees and hedging
6 Development to accord with agreed detail
7 Access, visibility and closure of accesses etc.
8 Development to accord with approved plans
10  Appl. No  : 2017/2393/F  
    Parish  : WYMONDHAM  
    Applicants Name  : Mr John Western  
    Site Address  : 29 Chapel Lane Wymondham NR18 0DJ  
    Proposal  : New detached dwelling.  
    Decision  : This item was **withdrawn** by the applicant

11  Appl. No  : 2017/2481/F  
    Parish  : DISS  
    Applicants Name  : Mr Karl Dade  
    Site Address  : 128 Victoria Road Diss IP22 4JN  
    Proposal  : Change of use of shed to hair salon  
    Decision  : Members voted 4-3 for **Refusal**  
    Refused  
    1  Unacceptable impact on residential amenity